

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Entry of Amendment

It is respectfully requested that the present Amendment should be entered into the official file because the Amendment places the application in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that the Amendment should be entered since no new issues have been generated by the amendments. That is, Applicants have only changed the term involving the “calling function” to a “paging function,” which is merely a change in terminology to clarify the claimed invention and not a change in the scope of the invention. Accordingly, entry of the Amendment and full consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Telephone Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the telephone interview conducted with Examiner Appiah on March 13, 2006. During that discussion, it was pointed out that the word “calling” in the claims was not meant to imply that speech was necessary, but that instead that “calling” involved the process of making the electronic connection between two points whether speech was used or not. Given this definition of “calling” it was pointed out that the references do not properly apply against the claims. While no agreement was reached as to patentability, it was agreed that Applicants would submit an amendment for full consideration of the issue.

Rejection Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1-3, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being anticipated by Silver et al. (U.S. Patent 5,701,337). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that Silver shows a wireless communication method using cellular network 43 and a non-calling wireless communication system including paging network 49, including the steps of calling by transmitting a paging signal, detecting the calling and notifying by activating the mobile phone by way of the pager so that the mobile phone is connected to the cellular network. Thus, Silver et al. utilizes a paging system to notify a cellular telephone system that a call is present. In response to Applicants' previous argument that the claim states that the communication system is a LAN system which does not have a calling function, the Examiner states that the paging system meets the non-calling system.

Applicants wish to point out that the claims have now been amended to utilize the term "paging" instead of "calling" in regard to the communication by the wide-area wireless communication system. Thus, this system first sends the page to let the recipient know that the communication is desired and upon this receipt a non-paging system is then capable of making a connection to transfer data. Thus, this can be a data network such as a local area network. In the Silver et al. reference, the corresponding system is a cellular telephone which is clearly not a "non-paging" system, since the cellular telephone can also be used to page (that is make an electronic connection to and give an indication of the connection at the receiving end with another cellular telephone). Thus, Applicants submit that while there is some similarity in that the reference has parallel systems of a pager and a cellular telephone while the present system has a pager and a data network, there are distinct differences between the two which are now clearly claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that the Silver et al. reference does not show that the wireless communication system is a "non-paging" system.

Thus, in the present invention the data system is a wireless network such as a wireless Lan which is not capable of placing a page to the other party. Thus, the pager system is utilized as an indicator that the LAN device should be turned on.

Claim 1 is a method claim which recites a number of steps in the process of sending a page from the calling side to the call side. This includes a paging sending step, a paging detecting step, a paging notifying step and a connecting step. Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable because the Silver et al. reference does not teach that the wireless communication system is a non-paging system and is capable of data communication.

Claim 3 is a system claim which describes the wireless communication system. Thus, this claim also describes the wireless communication terminal as a non-paging terminal. Accordingly, claim 3 is likewise allowable. Claim 7 is an apparatus claim describing the wide-area wireless communication base station. This claim is likewise allowable by describing the non-paging wireless communication terminal of the called side. Claim 9 is an independent apparatus claim describing the wireless communication terminal. This claim is likewise allowable for the same reasons recited above.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 10-12 and 14 depend from these allowable independent claims and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, these claims recite other features which make these claims additionally allowable. Thus, claims 5 and 12 specifically describe the use of a data network arrangement. Accordingly, these claims are additionally allowable.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Fujimori et al. (U.S. Patent 6,327,475). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that Fujimori et al. shows a base station having a network connecting means, a calling request receiving means, an identification number converting means and a calling means. Applicants submit that this reference does not teach the present invention.

Fujimori et al. relates to a pager which is capable of either group paging or sending a message through a group broadcast transmission into a selected paging base station which temporarily stores a plurality of telephone numbers and a message received by way of a telephone line. However, the reference does not teach two wireless communication systems which provide for wireless paging with the other having no paging function.

Thus, Applicants submit that Fujimori et al. does not meet the present claims and so does not show a non-paging wireless communication system. Instead, the two systems involved are pagers and telephones, both of which are paging systems. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims define over this reference as well.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claims 4 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Silver et al. in view of Tran (U.S. Patent 6,496,693). Claims 5/3 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Silver et al. in view of Blink (U.S. Patent 6,542,751). Claim 5/4 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious Silver et al. and Tran and further in view of Blink et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that even if these references show the various secondary features as suggested by the Examiner, these claims remain allowable based on their dependency from allowable independent claims. Further, Applicants submit that these secondary references do not aid the Silver et al. reference in overcome its deficiencies noted above. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this rejection is likewise overcome.

Applicants have also amended the specification to further describe that the term “calling” does not imply speaking. Applicants submit that this is understandable based on the original specification as well. In particular, the paragraph starting on page 3, line 6 of the specification

points out that the wireless LAN does not have a “calling function.” Furthermore, it is clear from the teachings of the specification that the “calling function” is provided by a pager system (see Fig. 1, elements 2 and 6). Thus, this makes it clear that speaking is not necessary in order for the connection to be made. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this change to the specification and claims does not involve new matter.

Further, it is noted that the claims continue to use the terms “calling side” and “called side.” These terms appear to be appropriate in the present use and have not yet been changed. However, if the Examiner feels that this change is also necessary, he is requested to suggest this to the Applicants.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

Dated: April 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,


Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

#43,368

f6/
JW